THE REAL REASON FOR THE COLD WAR

By Fred Stover

Note: This is the third instalment concluding Mr. Stover's article, as excerpted from his brilliant pamphlet "Peace and Parity". We agree with a subscriber who writes regarding this article, "The Fred Stover article should be printed in leaflet form and broadcast from an aeroplane over the large cities of U.S. and Canada."

War and Depression Parties

Many voters are coming to the conclusion that the Democratic Party is the war party and the Republican Party is the depression party. This is not correct. While some Republicans call the Korean War the Truman War, because they are aware of the people's revulsion against it, the fact remains that the whole war program, hot or cold, was a bipartisan program. This is evidenced by the fact that the altogether un-American China Lobby has its roots deep into both parties and that the chief architect of world reaction, Dulles, has been giving the signals for both Truman and Eisenhower. Further, the betrayal of much that we fought for in World War II as regards Western Europe and particularly Germany, has had the support and collaboration of both parties. And this support is not limited to some of the race-hating pro-fascist Dixiecrats of our South. It includes men who have been promenading as the great liberal leaders of the Democratic Party. Some of them "talk" a good line on many domestic measures but on foreign affairs have a record so bad that it makes the late Bob Taft's record look good in comparison. The record of some Democrats on voting colossal sums to underwrite and boondoggle tottering monarchies and dictators all over the world gives justification for branding them as the war party.

Some Republicans have offered some opposition to this indefensible waste of money and resources. At the same time, the opposition of most of the Republican leadership to needed domestic reform and particularly the farm program of Roosevelt gives ample justification for regarding that party as the party of depression.

Hopeful Signs

There are good signs, now, however, from individuals in both parties. Some Republican Congressmen are now carrying the ball on the matter of strengthening our price support programs and opposing the Benson program. Likewise, some Democratic leaders, congressmen and senators may rid their party of the stigma of being the war party.

On June 30th, 1953, Iowa's Senator Guy M. Gillette added to his record of honesty and political independence by a forthright speech against the extension of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, in which he traced this country's foreign policy actions since the second world war and concluded that we have changed from a country advocating peace to a country which, from all appearances, seems to be advocating war. He supported this conclusion by saying:

"In a recent issue of the U.S. News and World Report there is a list of 27 countries in which we, the United States of America, a leader in the struggle for a peaceful world, have substantial U.S. military forces--and 22 countries in which we have smaller missions or advisory groups. Therefore, at this very moment, after the great advancements that we had made in association with other leading nations in the direction of world security, we find that we have today either sizable forces or smaller military missions in 49 countries of the world.

"And the bill before us which presumes to effectuate these purposes is providing $4,765,523,000 for military assistance and $443,634,000 or less than 10%, for mutual development and technical progress. Over 90% for purely military aid; less than 10% for economic assistance. Can any doubt the cause and emphasis of our endeavors?"

"In all candor, Mr. President, I ask in which direction we are go toward war or toward peace? What are we trying to do in the world--ar trying to extend humanitarian, technical, and rehabilitation aid to fr nations in order to help them raise their standard of living--help the velop purchasing power and markets for our surpluses--aiding them in b ing themselves spiritually, morally, intellectually, and commercially, is our goal under the plausible sugar coating of these announced purpo the building and arming of a coalition for the sole and only purpose of establishing a powerful military alliance. I readily realize that it h been and will be repeatedly asserted that this alliance of strength of is to be used solely for defensive purposes and not for offense. But, President, there never has been in history a military alliance built th was not founded on the pretext that its purpose was solely for defense.

"My decision to cast my vote this year against the mutual security bill is by way of protest against the whole course our foreign policy i now taking. I am by no means opposed to everything in this bill any mo than I am opposed to every thread in the pattern of our foreign policy. I do not oppose assistance to foreign nations. I favor contributing ou share of relief and rehabilitation funds for war-ravaged areas, such as Korea. I favor the expenditure of funds through the United Nations for the Arab refugees, and I favor aid to the State of Israel for helping settle her refugees...

"But what do I find, Mr. President? A bill designed to make 90% o our foreign aid take the form of military equipment and supplies. Instead of building unity among people we are devoted solely to building unity of military command."

Placing Country Above Party

That indicates a declaration of independence, as it were, from Dul bi-partisan war oligarchy, the China Lobby and even more importantly th bi-partisan program of once again refinancing our World War I and World War II enemies. Other leading Democrats who make fine speeches on some domestic issues were instrumental in trying to whitewash American busin leaders and monopolies that had secret cartel agreements with the I.G. Farben war machine in Germany. How they conspired to obstruct our nati defense prior to World War II and to defeat the program of de-nazificat and de-cartelization after World War II is a gory record of real subver- sion. Thanks to the courage of Sen. Joe O'Mahoney who held hearings on cartel legislation, this record is available. (See "Treason's Peace-- German Dyes and American Dupes" by Howard Watson Ambruster...Beechhurst press.)

Independent leaders like Gillette, with the support of many others who are not hell-bent on holding a halo over Harry Truman, could still re-establish the principles and program of Roosevelt.

Likewise independent Republican leaders can redeem themselves and carry on in the best tradition of great independents like Weaver, Petti- grew, LaFollette and Norris. Even today there are such independents in the midwest, Robert Morss Lovett, one of the leaders in the anti-im- perialist league, our own George Cosson of Iowa, and last but not least the fearless and incorruptible Farmer-Labor Governor and Senator of Minnesota, Elmer Benson.

A Bi-Partisan Peace Program

Our two-party system is quite meaningless until a realistic align- ment is made on the basis of vital issues.

But things are not as hopeless as they may seem in spite of a bi- partisan foreign policy that is nearly all wrong.

Prior to the death of Wendell Willkie and Franklin D. Roosevelt, nearly all Americans were united on a bi-partisan program for world pea They favored unity among the major powers including, of course, Russia. Unity, through collaboration and mutual trust and understanding among th major powers was the cardinal principle on which U.N. was founded. This

was supported by the leaders of both parties. In order to emphasize the urgency of supporting his concept of "One World," Willkie said:

"I tell you that if a man is not, deep in his belly, in favor of the closest possible relations with Britain and Russia, then it does not matter what else he is. Such a man will be anti-labor, even if he praises labor 24 hours a day. He will be anti-labor because he will be working for a constricted America, a less prosperous America. For the very same reason the very same man will also be anti-business, in the deepest sense, even though he may consider himself a servant of business, even though he falls on his knees before business. He will be anti-business because he will be working for a smaller America, a less important America. This is the touchstone to a man's entire position in politics today. Only occasionally does it happen that one issue arises which is so controlling that every other issue is subsidiary to it, and this is it. But it is not enough for a man merely to repeat the right words about world collaboration. He has to be on fire with it. He has to feel, in his belly, that this is the door which will open outward to an expansion of American activity and prosperity. You cannot be wrong on this issue and right on any other."

On this paramount issue that dwarfs all other issues, Democratic Roosevelt agreed with Republican Willkie. In his last message to Congress, March 1, 1945, reporting on the Yalta Conference, he said that concord and unity among the great powers, particularly between America and the Soviet Union, can be achieved.

Roosevelt was right. The American people were united then too. They are not united now. They can never be united around the present policy of dividing the world into two warring camps and making war on oppressed people who are fighting for the same kind of independence our forefathers fought for in 1776. It is not possible to unite humanity around an anti-humanitarian program.

The United Nations

Today many people say the U.N. has failed in waging peace. That is wrong. The United States never permitted the U.N. to tackle the matter of negotiating peace in Korea. The U.N. did fail, but it failed in waging war, not in waging peace.

A great mistake was made in June of 1950 when the U.N. Secretary capitulated to American pressures and abandoned his 10-point peace plan, which had the approval of all the major powers but was rejected by Truman and Acheson. Instead he took sides in the Korean Civil War. When an umpire takes sides, the game is over.

The role of a belligerent or participant doesn't qualify one to be a mediator. The U.N. will not be able to fulfill its historic mission of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war by endorsing a war without any effort at negotiation, nor as long as it functions only as an adjunct of Dulles' State Department which in turn is even today trying to appease Syngman Rhee and the China Lobby.

The U.N. Charter rests on the assumption that all-important actions of the U.N. would have the agreement of the Five Great Powers. Otherwise, the U.N. would be but the agency for the policy of the strongest or richest power. This principle of five-power agreement implies the admission of the People's Republic of China to the U.N.

If the Powers could agree to act in concert, the veto would never be called for, but if they cannot, it is still better to agree to differ than to go to war.

The whole premise and charter of the U.N. were broken and scattered to the four winds by this "war to defend the U.N." as it was called. Well, which was it? Our press also boasted that it was a war against Communism.

Since the Communist countries were a party to the founding of the U.N. and since peace between Communist and Capitalist countries (as expressed in the principle of unanimity in its chief executive body) was the very pre-condition of its existence, how then could the U.N. be defended by a war on Communism? The answer is very easy--it can't. We can take

our choice. We can support the principles of the U.N. or we can suppor Dulles, but we cannot support both.

This fascist-minded agent of world embracing cartels is prostituti the U.N. to the purpose of world division which negates its reason for existence.

Dulles Must Go

Dulles wants to use the U.N. as the maneuvering ground for the Col War and as an instrument to enforce foreign policies beneficial to his cartels. Those who refuse to be the servitors of his economic imperial are branded as enemies. Any move on the part of oppressed people anywh to change the status quo is construed by him as an attack by Moscow, no matter how remote they may be from Moscow.

Unless the Socialist countries agree to smooth the path of colonia exploitation for Dulles, they are to face a continuation of his cold wa Dulles, therefore, and, more importantly, his war program, must go, for represents an era to which history is waving an everlasting farewell. Dulles may continue to fool some Americans by parading as a paragon of virtue, but his pious lectures on international morality will not fool Asians or Europeans while he is toadying to Syngman Rhee and the unrepe tent Nazis in West Germany.

McCARTHY AND THE ARMY

By Louise Harding

A number of weeks ago, Sen. McCarthy was admonished by Sen. Wiley "get on the team". He did--he is running it.

The difference between McCarthy and the Secretary of the Army start last October, when the senator broke into an investigation of its personnel at Fort Monmouth which the Army had started. At that time he got the headlines by announcing that he was developing information leading "extremely dangerous espionage," which "might envelop the whole Signal Corps" and "rival the Rosenberg case". N.Y. Times and Washington Post published a series of articles denying the charge, and Secretary Steven came out with a statement confirming the press.

In October of last year, McCarthy told newsmen that at a closed hea ing a "mystery witness" confessed to lying, "talked about members of the Rosenberg spy ring, said he knew Julius Rosenberg very well," and "wante to tell the truth". Nov. 10, N.Y. Post, said this witness had been clea and given back his job at Ft. Monmouth; that subsequent inquiry showed witness' condition was due to emotional strain from the death of his mot two days earlier (AP). McCarthy had been very definite and sensational his charges. Oct. 12, he said that the situation "has all the earmarks extremely dangerous espionage". Oct. 14, he asserted a number of important radar documents were missing from the Fort and "in the hands of the Russians". Next day, (N.Y. Herald Tribune) he said that Julius Rosenber executed atomic spy, organized an espionage ring at the Fort and "it may still be in operation".

Although the Army stated in November that they found no evidence of "current espionage," McCarthy scheduled his open hearings and declared: "He (the Army spokesman) is not speaking for the committee."

Dec. 16, he backed down and said he was only trying to prove "poten tial espionage" at the Army Signal Corps laboratories at Fort Monmouth, N. J., by his current series of hearings.

Jan. 30, a committee of the Federation of American Scientists said (AP) recent investigations of Ft. Monmouth had caused "a serious disrup- tion of scientific work at the Army radar laboratory there". Yale Uni- versity Physicist Ernest C. Pollard said, "no charges of actual espionag or real subversive activity have ever been made against any of the 19 scientists suspended or the ten scientists who have been transferred to unclassified work."

Feb. 11, Carl Greenblum was suspended from his Signal Corps job; his lawyer said he had been informed of no reason. Greenblum identified himself as McCarthy's "mystery witness" in the Oct. 16 hearing. McCarthy had claimed that this witness had said he "wanted to tell everything".

Feb. 18, McCarthy, sitting as a committee of one, hauled Brigadier Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker over the coals regarding the honorable discharge from the Army of Maj. Irving Peress, who had stood on his rights under the Fifth Amendment and refused to answer McCarthy on the question of Communist affiliations. McCarthy told the General that he lacked "the brains of a five-year-old child". "General", said he, "let's try and be truthful." Stevens, standing on a former directive of former President Truman, had ordered Zwicker not to answer certain inquiries, and when Zwicker refused, McCarthy told him he was unworthy to wear his uniform.

McCarthy: You did learn, did you not, from the newspaper reports, that this man was part of the Communist conspiracy, or at least that there was strong evidence that he was.....

Zwicker: He has never been tried for that, sir, and there was evidence, Mr. Chairman--

McCarthy: Don't you give me that double-talk. Etc.

After the hearing, McCarthy gave out a statement on Zwicker's testimony, and Zwicker said he was astonished to see how it was distorted. He disputed the accuracy of the official transcript, claiming it omitted abusive statements McCarthy had made during the hearing.

McCarthy demanded that Zwicker appear for rehearing, along with all involved in the Peress discharge. Stevens, angry at the way Zwicker had been treated, refused to comply, but said he would show up himself at a hearing on Thursday, the 25th: the proceedings were to be televised.

The political editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, Earl C. Behrens, said it appeared evident that Stevens had Eisenhower's backing. However, Eisenhower returned to Washington from Palm Springs on the 24th; and at a noonday luncheon with McCarthy and others, on that day, Stevens signed a statement in which he agreed to exactly what McCarthy had asked of him. Nothing was said in the statement about Army officers getting proper treatment in the future, although Stevens said he was so assured.

UP mentioned that N.Y. Times said the cancellation of the showdown hearing was so abrupt that there was little doubt Stevens' "about face" reflected high Administration policy decisions.

It was reported to Stevens that McCarthy had told a reporter after Stevens left, the Secretary couldn't have given in "more abjectly if he had got down on his knees".

McCarthy said (UP) the subcommittee did not give Stevens any assurances that it would not abuse future witnesses because that would imply that it had abused witnesses in the past.

James B. Reston wrote, Feb. 25, "As one distinguished observer put it, 'The Secretary didn't mean to surrender to Senators McCarthy, Everett Dirkson, and Karl Mundt yesterday; he merely thought they wanted to look at his sword.'"

San Francisco Chronicle editorially deplores McCarthy's tendency to "play the medieval inquisitor in the browbeating of such witnesses as Brigadier General Ralph Zwicker."

The browbeating of witness Carl Greenblum was not dwelt on in the press, although Greenblum said that, in his nervous state, it had driven him to tears. The death of Harry Dexter White was clearly attributable to the treatment that he, an ill man, got at the hands of another of these committees. Very little was said about <u>that</u>, too.

"<u>I Like McKay, And McKay Likes Me</u>."

Aside from the fact that an Army man was involved, there was little reason to suppose Eisenhower would back Stevens up. Not long ago, he proposed that U.S. citizens convicted of violation of the Smith Act--i.e., who had been accused of "<u>conspiring to advocate</u>" the forcible overthrow of the government -- should be deprived of their citizenship. He wants them put in the miserable position of known adherents of the former

Spanish Republic who, under Franco, are now compelled to report on thei activities and deprived of all chance to earn even the poor livelihood other Spanish workers "enjoy". Even the New Statesman and Nation speak this Eisenhower proposal as "malicious". Yet, Eisenhower has himself p tographed in front of the Abraham Lincoln memorial statue, with its quo inscription, "With malice toward none..."

Governor Shivers, of the oil-corporations-run state of Texas, want all known Communists executed, on the claim--which is ridiculous--that small minority, who are not fools, have a hallucination that they could seize the army, navy, arsenals, etc.

Individuals like McCarthy have been running around the country re- cently (McCarthy is paid by the Republican national committee for this) delivering Lincoln-Day addresses. O tempora!

Lincoln said: "This country, with its institutions, belongs to th people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing ernment, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, o their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it."

At Charleston, W. Va., Feb. 4, McCarthy said: "The hard fact is t those who wear the label Democrat, wear with it the stain of a historic trayal." He termed it "a political label stitched with the idiocy of a Truman; rotted by the deceit of an Acheson; corrupted by the Red slime a White."

Fascist ranting; but that is all the issue reactionary Republicani has to fall back on in the forthcoming Congressional elections.

I like McKay,
For when times are blue,
Every times he hollers "Red!",
I gain a vote or two.

McCarthy told a news conference at Dallas, Texas, Feb. 11, (AP) tha if the election were held now, his candidate would be Mr. Eisenhower "a I think he'll be the candidate in '56."

"Last Man Out":

The total unreliability of McCarthy's statements is well known--he matches Hitler in that respect. In February 1950, in Wheeling, W. Va., he asserted flatly that he had a list of 205 Communists working in the State Department. Challenged to substantiate this, he was unable to mak good, on even one, but kept on brazenly repeating the claim. McCarthy smells strongly of oil. Naturally, the oil barons regard as high treas the proposition that oil and other natural resources belong to all the people and should be used for the common interest rather than to buy ele tions for Big Business.

McCarthy's influence in FCC, is reflected in talks by Virgil Pinckl who recently was heard to laud Spellman for breaking the gravediggers' strike; and in the weekly "Last Man Out" broadcast. Listening to the windup of this latter, on Feb. 5, your reporter heard the speaker decry the use of the word "Liberalism" and seek to smear that, saying that if one spoke of a woman being liberal with her charms, that had no very goo significance. Here the cloven foot of Roman Catholic reaction sticks ou

"Let him be anathema who affirms that the Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile and adapt himself to progress, to Liberalism and to modern culture." --Pius IX (never repudiated by his successors.)

Upon What Meat is This McCarthy Fed,
That He Has Grown So Great?

Washington, March 11, UP and AP--The Army reported today that it ha been subjected to direct threats by Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy and his chie counsel, Roy Cohn, in an effort to obtain preferential treatment for G. David Schine, an investigator for the McCarthy Committee, who was draft into the Army.

The Army disclosed that Cohn threatened to "wreck the Army" when to Schine probably would be sent overseas.

Cohn also threatened to cause the firing of Army Secretary, Robert

. Stevens while intervening in behalf of Schine, the Army reported.

--Here is a clue as to why Stevens "caved in" before McCarthy. And why were such threats potent? It has long been evident that both old parties were truckling to Jesuitism, and this column has frequently remarked on this fact. Both the Republican and Democratic conventions at Chicago invoked the blessings of divine power through Stritch, the Chicago Jesuit who was implicated in the plot to form a clerico-fascist state in central Europe. Eisenhower lately set a precedent when, accompanied by many powerful members of his administration, he attended a "Red Mass" in Washington. Not long ago, he entertained at dinner the extreme Jesuit reactionary, Bishop Fulton Sheen. During the last campaign, Stevenson was pictured in the press in a most affectionate greeting by Spellman. Etc. Recently, Drew Pearson remarked that the Administration coddles McCarthy because it hopes to swing the balance in the coming elections, through the Roman Catholic vote.

This explains the fact that so much talk goes on about "McCarthyism" --Jesuitism and Fascism being never mentioned. The mountain labored over changes in procedure in so-called investigating committees, and produced the mouse of a recommendation that single-man (McCarthy) hearings be abolished, etc., but the Congress entirely failed to make mandatory the reforms proposed.

"It's up to the committees, each one of them," said Sen. Ferguson, head of Senate Republican Policy Committee, as reported March 3.

Said Eisenhower, cagily, at his news conference March 10, regarding the onslaught against McCarthy made by Sen. Flanders:

".....when Senator Flanders points up the danger of us engaging in internecine warfare, and magnifying certain items of procedure and right and personal aggrandizement, and all such questions.....then he is doing a service.....Now, I am not going to be in a position of endorsing every word he said or how he said it. I don't know. All I saw of it was a little bit of thing on television last evening."

Asked what will happen if one of the Air Force technicians sent to Indo China is captured or killed, Eisenhower replied,

".....There is going to be no involvement of America in war unless it is a result of the constitutional process that is placed upon Congress to declare it....."

Regarding the so-called defense program, Eisenhower said he was using his best judgment, "and I am not going to demagogue (sic) about it!" (Remarkable diction for the ex-president of a great university.)

In the foregoing, it will be observed that Eisenhower sought to give the impression that Flanders thought too much stress was being laid on "items of procedure and right". His point was nothing of the sort: it was that too little stress was laid on these by McCarthy.

As to the danger regarding Indo China: it is obvious that if the technicians (sent without the knowledge of the Armed Services Committee) were wiped out by a bomb--as might very well happen in the present situation--war would be declared by Congress immediately.

\+ + + + + + + + + + + +

USA: GOOD NEIGHBOR OR OCTOPUS?

By The Editor

In the early 1800's the USA, a colony-becoming-a-nation, protected its baby industries with an import tariff in order to keep European-manufactured imports out of its domestic market.

The same USA, today a nation-with-colonies, still babying its industries now grown big, is overflowing its domestic market and needs to export the overflow.

But many of the countries it wants to export to are industrially young and want, as did the US in the 1800's, to develop their own domestic

markets, to do which they in turn may restrict manufactured imports. Th cross purposes arise between the US and the colonies-becoming-nations of this mid-century. This brings about what the recent inter-American conference in Caracas called "enforced colonialism" on the part of the US.

The US economy has become accustomed to selling around 8% of all it production in foreign markets. It still exports farm products. Nearly half its wheat and flour go abroad, a quarter of its tobacco and over a third of its cotton. These and other crops, plus one-tenth of its agricultural implements, trucks and rolled steel products amounted in recent years to over 20 billion dollars worth each year.

But the US only imported from foreign countries 15 billion dollars worth in each same year. So these foreign countries owe the USA a debt which is growing each year by 5 billion dollars.

This is called an export surplus. If I trade 20 marbles for 15 mar bles I am out 5 marbles. Where will I get them? Who pays for the "expo surplus"?

Up to now the taxpayers of the USA have paid for it by government g and credits with the help of exported private capital (money invested in foreign industry), all of which have carried social, economic and politi consequences.

The USA could of course adopt a policy of "free trade", but this wo be very upsetting to American manufacturers and their employees who have so long been accustomed to protection.

The world problem, as of this moment, is the USA and what to do wit her export surplus? And/or what to do with her production surplus?

This problem is not unique with the USA. But at the moment the USA down with a bad dose of it. Slogans such as "Trade, Not Aid" only aggra vate the trouble. The present US Congress is for no trade, no aid. And they boss the show. Even the CIO is for a one-sided reciprocity, applau ing the "escape clause" designed to cancel trade concessions which presu ably threaten American production and employment or which apply to products receiving government price support. Free trade with such escape hatches hardly makes for stability. The USA is curtailing trade at this moment and threatening further curtailments in products vital to the lif of Canada. It is fantastic to believe that under the traditional protec tion party she will inaugurate free trade. Such a foreign policy would require a vast correlative domestic program for the rehabilitation of workers and capitalists hit by the influx of foreign goods.

Where is the imagination requisite for such a program? The boldnes Even in a time of relatively full employment, during wars and rumors of war, it turns out to be difficult enough. But as the spectre of peace a pears, as the profiteer becomes parched for easy quick big killings, wha then? Can the "businessman's" government plan and execute measures involving a complete reversal of his life-long business habits?

And is it not too late to hope for guidance from the opposition party whose free trade tradition has long been abandoned?

We seem to be getting back to the Coolidge era whose "I'll sell but I won't buy" tariff was one of the conditions for the rise of that exaggerated nationalism in Europe known as fascism. And just as in that era US capitalism was spreading into Europe so today it is spreading across the world, its recently announced new look having the very old and ugly look of that same fascist threat.

It is participating in the resurrection of Japanese and German industrial power, drawing both down the path of suicidal adventure, it is reaching deep into the economic life of Africa and the Far East, deep into the economic life of the American hemisphere, North and South, is taking a strong hold on the entire British Commonwealth, pulling and twisting all this life towards the precipice of war.

This policy has gone forward under both Republican and Democratic administrations, as Fred Stover points out in his "Real Reason for the Cold War". The policy itself has a vested interest in insanity, for it is only in the mind-paralysing fear of communism that peoples and gov-

ernments will permit themselves to be gobbled up. Fascism, a form of insanity becomes a thing to be desired in allies of the US. That is why Spain is courted and the fascist elements in Germany. Dulles, the spokesman of the earth-eaters, is thoroughly at home in the fascist atmosphere.

But the policy is beginning to produce a stomach-ache in US government and business circles and a headache in those allies who during World War II got a taste of fascist domination. The newspapers of this continent usually present these headaches as problems. The French fear of a revived Nazi Germany, for instance, is posed as a "problem" for the US and not as a thoroughly justified fear on the part of France.

Another "problem" is the reticence of the Japanese to prepare for a new war, this time as an ally of the author of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. These and many other "problems" are multiplying themselves as old trading nations begin to lose their markets to the new "dynamic" nations mentioned so favorably by Dulles when the old ones were fighting for their lives.

The premise of the manifest destiny of American imperialism is accepted by press and pulpit of all parties and creeds. Opposition to it is not tolerated. It is not "imperialism" anyway. It is spreading the gospel of Americanism, shedding light on the dark places of the earth. The unselfishness of the "good neighbor" policy, of the Marshall Plan, of Point 4, etc. is a not-to-be-denied dogma on this continent. It was repeated by Prime Minister St. Laurent of Canada in the Indian Parliament recently when he announced that India has nothing to fear from the American arming of Pakistan, and went on to say that the United States is the most unselfish power ever to play the role of world leader and "has no other ambition than to live and let others live in mutually helpful international intercourse..." He asked "Does anyone really believe that the United States would bring about aggressive or provocative collective action by the countries associated with it?"

Kenneth McNaught of Winnipeg comments in the Toronto Globe and Mail: "Has the Prime Minister forgotten so soon the manner in which the United States compelled its associates in Korea to share in the 'provocative collective action' of the advance to the Yalu River--which was responsible for bringing China into active participation in Korea? Again, one might ask, how can any Canadian so misread American history as to come up with the entertaining myth that Americans are peace-loving and unambitious?

"In what obscure corner does Mr. St. Laurent secrete the facts of the War of 1812; the American refusal to forego the future acquisition of Spanish-American territory according to the plan suggested by Canning in 1822; the exploits of Andrew Jackson in Florida; the long and vicious series of Indian wars and treaties; the purely acquisitive war with Mexico; the 'unselfish' claim to the whole of British Columbia in the election cry of 'fifty-four forty or fight'; the pregnant doctrine of 'unconditional surrender' that emerges from the bloody devastation of the Civil War; the southern and western tradition of lynching, violence and lawlessness; the ruffianly belligerence of the raids across Canadian borders from the 1830's to the 1870's; the Spanish-American War which laid the foundation of overseas American expansion by the acquisition of Puerto Rico, the Philippines and other Pacific island bases (unless this phase could be said to have commenced with the astute purchase of Alaska in the year of Canadian Confederation); the T.R. Roosevelt policy of 'speaking softly' and carrying 'a big stick'--which led to the seizure of Panama, the chicanery of the Alaska boundary tribunal with its decision against Canada, and the extension of American hegemony across Central America and the Caribbean? These are but some of the high spots in the history of an essentially military and expansive nation.

"When Mr. Whitelaw Reid was arranging the transfer of the Philippines to the United States he redefined Manifest Destiny by saying that the transfer was the first step in a process that would make the Pacific Ocean an American lake. Mr. John Foster Dulles in his Japanese treaty, his Pacific defense pact with Australia and New Zealand, his Chinese and Indo-Chinese policies has carried this imposing dream measurably closer to reality."

(To be continued in the May issue.)

ONE

(Formerly The Protestant)

APRIL 1954

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard, Jr.
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
David Lord
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Rev. D. McKeen Reid
Leslie Roberts
Raymond Robins
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

ONE is published monthly by New Christian Books, 2 Seymour Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No agents.**

ONE

He hath made of one blood
All Nations

April 1954 Edited by Kenneth Leslie

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

REAL REASON FOR THE COLD WAR

By Fred Stover

McCARTHY AND THE ARMY

By Louise Harding

U.S.A.: GOOD NEIGHBOR OR OCTOPUS?

By The Editor

Vol. X, No. 6 30 Cents